

~~SECRET~~

5. *Final Policy*
General J
55

26th November, 1959.

COCOM Document 3715.26/1B

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

ON

ITEM 1526 - COMMUNICATION CABLE

12th, 13th and 17th November, 1959.

Present: Belgium(Luxembourg), Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Docs. Nos. 3700.3, 6 and 9, 3715.00/1 and W.P. 1526/1 - 3.

1. The FRENCH Delegation suggested that the following exclusion clause be added:

"except those specially designed for signalling, control and service transmissions for railways."
2. The GERMAN Delegation believed that this clause would not make it possible to exclude from embargo cables such as those for example whose supply to the U.S.S.R. had given rise to such lengthy discussion in the Committee. The German Delegation therefore felt that the solution might be found in the drafting of a Note to the effect that the Committee would give favourable consideration to certain export proposals.
3. The NETHERLANDS Delegation were not in favour of the French proposal and would in principle prefer not change the present definition. They themselves were thinking of possibly proposing that a Note be drafted to permit the export of cable if it represented 20% of the total value of the installation.
4. As this proposal created certain practical difficulties for several delegations, especially where the possibility of estimating the total value of an installation in a Sino-Soviet Bloc country was concerned, the NETHERLANDS Delegation agreed to the principle behind the German proposal.
5. The JAPANESE Delegation agreed in principle to the German proposal.
6. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegation stated that, after a thorough study of the strategic importance of Item 1526, their authorities were in favour of some adequate relaxation of the control applied in this field.
7. The UNITED STATES Delegation were unable to accept the French proposal for the reasons given in COCOM Doc. No. 3700.9. They were, however, in principle ready to recommend to their Government the idea of a Note along the lines suggested by the German Delegation.
8. The ITALIAN Delegation were willing to study a Note of the kind suggested by the German Delegate.
9. The FRENCH Delegation then suggested that the definition might be changed to read:

"Communication carrier-frequency cable (including submarine cable) of any CCIF type containing more than one pair of conductors and containing any conductor, single or stranded, exceeding 0.9 mm. in diameter except those specially designed for signalling, control and service transmissions for railways."

SECRET

- 2 -

COCOM Document 3715.26/1B

10. The GERMAN Delegation in turn suggested the following redefinition:

"Communication cable (including submarine cable) of any type containing more than one pair of conductors having a capacity of less than 24 nanofarads and containing any conductor, single or stranded, exceeding 1.2 mm. in diameter."

11. At the close of a meeting of the Working Group, the COMMITTEE was faced with two proposals, one from the United States Delegation and the other from the French and German Delegations.

(A) United States proposal (amended according to W.P. 1526 / 3)

Add a third paragraph to the Note reading as follows:

"Governments will give sympathetic consideration to exceptions requests for the shipment of reasonable quantities of communications cable where the proposing Government has concluded that the following conditions are met:

- (a) The cable is part of a complete railway signal system installation being obtained from Free World sources, such system not to include communication equipment embargoed under Items 1519 and 1523;
- (b) Installation within the Bloc will be made by Free World firms;
- (c) The character and capacity of the cable and the location of the installation make it unlikely that it will be diverted to strategic use within the Bloc."

(B) Franco-German proposal

Add the following exclusion clause to the definition:

"except cables for signalling and/or control or for signalling and/or control and communication specially designed and shielded for use on railway lines, having an effective capacity of not less than 26 nF/km and containing no conductor exceeding 1.2 mm. in diameter."

12. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegation were able to accept the Franco-German proposal ad referendum if it took the form of a Note permitting administrative exceptions rather than be included in the definition. The FRENCH and GERMAN Delegations agreed to this suggestion, and the final version of their proposal read as follows:

"NOTE: Governments may permit, as administrative exceptions, exports of cable for signalling and/or control, or for signalling and/or control and communications (by telephone or telegraph), specially designed and shielded for use on electrified railway lines, having a capacity of not less than 26 nF/km and containing no conductor exceeding 1.2 mm. in diameter. All such exports should be reported to the Committee in the monthly statistics."

13. The BELGIAN Delegation accepted the Franco-German proposal, and the ITALIAN Delegation agreed to it ad referendum. The JAPANESE Delegation likewise preferred it to the United States proposal.

14. On November 17, the UNITED STATES Delegate said he was sure the authorities of the other Member Governments would give earnest further consideration to the exceptions provision suggested by his Delegation. He noted that his own authorities were giving further study to the precise terms and wording of the Note the United States Delegation had submitted (para 11A, above). In the view of the United States, such an exceptions provision would have to meet these basic requirements: that the nature of the terminal equipment be known; that the use of the installation be non-strategic; that installation be done by Free World firms.

SECRET

SECRET

- 3 -

COCOM Document 3715.26/1B

15. The FRENCH Delegate undertook to transmit the United States proposal to his authorities, although the requirements stated therein for the licensing of an export might well give rise to serious practical difficulties. He wished nevertheless to point out that the Franco-German proposal had already been accepted by several delegations, and that it therefore warranted careful study by the United States Government.

CONCLUSION: The COMMITTEE noted that agreement had not been reached on Item 1526, and agreed to resume study of it during the second round of discussion.

S E C R E T